



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

PN

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,881	06/26/2003	Shivaram Bhat	03226.497001;P9016	7839
32615	7590	12/15/2005	EXAMINER	
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010			MYINT, DENNIS Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/608,881	BHAT ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Dennis Myint	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2003.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 26 June 2003 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .

5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-27 have been examined.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claim 1, 3, 8, 9, 15, 16, 18, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sylor et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0186238) in view of Brun et al. (European Patent Application EP1009130A1).

Referring to claim 1, Sylor et al. is directed to a system and method for managing resources, said method comprising: accessing a list of resources ("Visual Hierarchy" of resources, Sylor et al., Paragraph 0049), wherein a resource comprises an object defined by a service type (Sylor et al., Paragraph 0051 and Paragraph 0063) and wherein a resource is identifiable by a resource name (Sylor et al., Paragraph 0064); identifying a relationship between said first and second resources (Sylor et al., Paragraph 0049-0050+); and

representing said first and second resources in an organizational structure ("logical hierarchy") reflecting said relationship (Sylor et al., Paragraph 0049-0050,0063-0064 and 0075+).

Sylor et al. does not recite that name of a first resource and name of a second resource are compared to identify a relationship between them. However, Brun et al., teaches a system and method of distributed directory services for locating network resources wherein name of a first resource and name of a second resource are compared (Brun et al., Column 1 Line-32-42) to identify the relationship between them (Brun et al., Column 15 Line35-57, Column 16 Line-30-50 and Column 19 Line-32 through Column 20 Line-45).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method taught by Sylor et al. for managing resources with the system and method taught by Brun et al. for managing distributed directory services and locating network resources so that the combined system and method would compare the name of a first resource and the name of a

second resource to identify their relationship and represent them in an organizational structure reflecting the relationship. One would have been motivated in order to "define a simple and effective method and system for locating a resource in large networks" (Brun et al., Column 8 Line-20-24).

Claim 9 and 16 are rejected on the same basis as claim 1.

Referring to claim 3, the system and method taught by Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. as discussed above with regard to claim 1 discloses the invention as claimed. Said system and method comprises listing said resources in order according to their respective relationships ("Fishbone Hierarchy ", Sylor et al., Paragraph 0137-0147+).

Claim 18 is rejected on the same basis claim 3.

Referring to claim 8, the system and method taught by Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. as discussed above with regard to claim 1 discloses the invention as claimed. In the said system and method, one of the first and second resources is identified as a sub-resource of the other (Paragraph 0076-0080).

Claim 15 and 23 are rejected on the same basis as claim 8.

3. Claim 2, 10, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. and further in view of Ramamoorthy (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0213258).

Referring to claim 2, the system and method of Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. as applied to claim 1 inherently receives a request identifying a resource (Sylor et al., Paragraph 0137—0147+) and locating said resource in said organization structure

(Sylor et al., Paragraph 0137—0147+). Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. as applied to claim 1 does not explicitly teach that said system and method determines whether said resource is subject to an access policy. However, Ramamoorthy teaches a system and method for information technology management policies wherein resources are associated with access policy (Ramamoorthy, Paragraph 0018-0025+) and requestors are inherently checked for access privileges (Ramamoorthy, Paragraph 0036).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art combine the system and method taught by Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. as applied to claim 1 with the system and method taught by Ramamoorthy for associating access policy with computing resources so that the combined system and method would receive a request for a resource, locates the resource in the resource hierarchical structure, and determines if the resource is subject to an access policy. One would have been motivated to do so simply because access to computing resources should be restricted using access policies for security concerns.

Claim 10 and 17 are rejected on the same basis as claim 2.

4. Claim 4, 11, 19, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. and further in view of Loucks et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5434974).

Referring to claim 4, the system and method of Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. as applied to claim 1 teaches that a resource name comprises a plurality of components (“resource identifier prefix, resource identifier type, resource identifier”, Brun et al.,

Column 15, Line45-58) but fails to disclose that those components are separated by a delimiter. However, Loucks et al. discloses a system and method for name resolution in a multi-system network wherein delimiters are used to separate names (Loucks et al., Column 10 Line-17-59+).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method taught by Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. with the system and method taught by Loucks et al. for name resolution so that the combined system and method would separate components of resource names with delimiters. One would have been motivated to do so in order to "provide an improved system and method for constructing and resolving resource names in a naming system" (Loucks et al., Column 2 Line-2-6).

Claim 11, 19 and 24 are rejected on the same basis as claim 4.

5. Claim 5, 6, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. and further in view of Loucks et al. and further in view of Carmel et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0128615).

Referring to claim 5, the system and method of Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. and further in view of Loucks et al. as applied to claim 4 above does not explicitly teaches comparing resource names comprises receiving information identifying what is used as said identifier. However, Carmel et al. teaches a system and method for

indexing and querying documents wherein context delimiters are used both indexing and querying into documents (Carmel et al., Paragraph 0041-0043 and 0047-0048).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method taught by Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. and further in view of Loucks et al. as applied to claim 4 above with the system and method taught by Carmel et al. for indexing and querying into documents so that, in the combined system and method, comparing would comprise receiving information identifying what is used as the delimiter in resource names. One would have been motivated to do so simply to identify different components of the resource name.

Claim 12, 20 and 25 are rejected on the same basis as claim 5.

Referring to claim 6, the system and method taught by Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. and further in view of Loucks et al. and further in view of Carmel et al. as discussed above with regard to claim 5 discloses the invention as claimed. In the said system and method, comparing comprises receiving information for wildcard pattern matching of resource names (Carmel et al., Paragraph 0049).

Claim 13, 21 and 26 are rejected on the same basis as claim 6.

6. Claim 7, 14, 22, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. and further in view of Loucks et al. and further in view of Carmel et al. and Shrader et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6026440).

Referring to claim 7, the system and method of Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. and further in view of Loucks et al. and further in view of Carmel et al. as applied to claim 5 above does not teach that comparing comprises receiving indicating whether a

resource name is case-sensitive. However, Shrader et al. teaches a system and method for web server account management wherein threshold keywords are indicated whether they are case-sensitive or not (Shrader et al., Column 9 Line-55 through Column 10 Line-20+).

At the time the invention was made, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of identifying whether keywords/names are case-sensitive or not as taught by Shrader et al. to the system and method taught by Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. and further in view of Loucks et al. and further in view of Carmel et al. as applied to claim 5 above so that, in the resultant system and method, comparing would comprise receiving information indicating whether a resource name is case-sensitive or not. One would have been motivated to do so simply for better identification of resource names.

Claim 14, 22 and 27 are rejected on the same basis as claim 7.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Myint whose telephone number is (571) 272-5629. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dennis Myint

AU-2162

*John E. Breene*  
JOHN BREENE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

B6